

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

RICHARD R. SAINTCALLE,)	CASE NO. C06-0040-MJP-MAT
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
)	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
C/O L. RODRIGUEZ, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of his motion for leave to serve defendants with a revised set of interrogatories. The Court, having reviewed plaintiff's motion, and the balance of the record, does hereby find and ORDER:

(1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 26) is DENIED. On March 17, 2006, plaintiff filed a motion seeking leave to serve defendants with a revised first set of interrogatories. Plaintiff explained in that motion that defendants had objected to his original interrogatories because he had exceeded the maximum number of interrogatories allowable under the discovery rules, and because he failed to sign the interrogatories. Defendants, in their response to that motion, argued that plaintiff's request was moot because they had already answered the interrogatories. Based on defendants' representation that they had already answered the interrogatories, this Court denied as moot plaintiff's motion for leave to serve defendants with a

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
PAGE -1

01 revised first set of interrogatories.

02 Plaintiff now seeks reconsideration of the Court's prior ruling pursuant to Local Rule CR
03 7(h). He explains in his motion for reconsideration that it was not his intention to serve defendants
04 with actual modified interrogatories which would require answers from defendants, it was merely
05 his intention to provide defendants with a signed version of the interrogatories to prevent the
06 interrogatories from being stricken at a later date.

07 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will be granted only in limited
08 circumstances. The Court will ordinarily deny motions for reconsideration "in the absence of a
09 showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which
10 could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule CR
11 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has offered nothing by way of evidence or argument to persuade this Court that
12 its prior ruling was erroneous. More importantly, the Court notes that plaintiff's instant motion
13 is unnecessary. Plaintiff does not require the Court's permission to correct the particular
14 procedural error at issue here. If plaintiff wishes to send defendants a signed version of his
15 interrogatories together with an explanation as to why he is taking this step, that is a decision
16 which rests entirely with him and need not involve the Court.

17 (2) The Clerk shall send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for defendants, and
18 to the Honorable Marsha J. Pechman.

19 DATED this 23rd day of May, 2006.

20 
21 Mary Alice Theiler
22 United States Magistrate Judge